

JUN 12 2007

Application No.: 10/823,489

Docket No.: JCLA12709

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are allowed. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostojic (U.S. Patent No.6, 771, 052) in view of Giannopoulos (U.S. Patent No.6, 549, 432). The claim 12 has been amended without prejudice or disclaimer in order to more clarify the claimed invention. To be consistent with amendments to claim 12, paragraph [0061] of specification is accordingly amended. It is noted that amendments to claim 12 and the specification do not introduce any new matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejections based on the following arguments and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/823,489

Docket No.: JCLA12709

Discussion of objection to claim 1 due to its informality

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 3 "both of which cascade a first output capacitor" should be changed to "both of which cascade from a first output capacitor."

In response thereto, the claim 1 is amended as instructed by the Examiner in order to eliminate informality.

Discussion of rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostojic (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,052) in view of Giannopoulos (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,432).

In response thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based on the following arguments. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine references teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teachings or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d

Application No.: 10/823,489

Docket No.: JCLA12709

488, 20 USPQ2d 1438(Fed. Cir.1991).

The Examiner alleged that Giannopoulos teaches a buck switch which begins to turn on synchronously with the input voltage from the rectifier at the time the converter turns off and turn off at the time before the time when the converter turns on (see timing diagram in Fig.6).However, the amended claim 22 is partly recited as follows.

A power supply with multiple outputs, comprising :

a converter with a main switch, a rectifier and a output capacitor; and

a buck converter, wherein the buck switch begins to turn on at the time when the converter has a pulse current to the output capacitor and turn off at the time before the time when the main switch turns on (emphasis added).

Fig.6 shown in Giannopoulos only discloses timing relationship between secondary rectifier diodes and a primer switch of a flyback converter, but fails to disclose **claimed buck converter**. That is, Giannopoulos fails to disclose the timing relationship between post-end buck switch and front end converter. Since Ostojic discloses a DC-DC power supply associated with buck converters, any artisan is not motivated to combine Ostojic and Giannopoulos to arrive at the invention because Giannopoulos teaches away from Ostojic. Furthermore, from Fig.6 in Giannopoulos, it definitely fails to show timing diagram across output capacitor of front

Application No.: 10/823,489

Docket No.: JCLA12709

converter because Fig.6 refers to flyback converter, as shown in Fig.5, which doesn't include a claimed output capacitor of a front converter. Accordingly, Giannopoulos fails to teach, suggest or disclose "the buck switch begins to turn on at the time when the converter has a pulse current to the output capacitor and turn off at the time before the time when the main switch turns on," as claimed in amended claim 22, and nor does the combination of Ostojic and Giannopoulos. In other words, either Ostojic and Giannopoulos or combination thereof, fails to teach, suggest or disclose the above-described limitation of amended claim 22.

Accordingly, the amended 22 is not rendered obvious because a prima facie case of obviousness is not well established, and thus patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 23 and 24, they should be patentable for the reason that they contain all limitations of their patentable base independent claim 22.

JUN 12 2007

Application No.: 10/823,489

Docket No.: JCLA12709


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 22-24 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 6-12-2007

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330